

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended to recite that keys are authorization keys. These amendments are supported by the specification as filed, for example at: ¶¶ 0046 and 0052. No new matter is added. Typographical errors have been corrected in claims 1 and 16. The objection to claim 16 is now moot.

The office action concedes that Marsh (U.S. Patent 7,080,039) does not teach or suggest selectively broadcasting matching authorization keys or personalization data to one or more receivers via the broadcast stream, as presently claimed. See Office Action at page 4.

Wilson (U.S. Patent 5,742,680) does not overcome the shortcomings of Marsh. Wilson describes a satellite television distribution system in which encrypted television programming is decoded for display at a set top box using decryption keys stored on smart cards associated with the set top boxes. At col. 5, ll. 30-40 Wilson indicates that the decryption keys stored on the smart cards may be updated by sending new keys over an encrypted data channel of the satellite distribution system. Such a distribution, it appears, is indiscriminate and would apply to all smart cards in all set top boxes. Hence, if one were to combine these teachings with those of Marsh, presumably the resulting scheme would be one in which such updating of decryption keys occurred indiscriminately.

In marked contrast, the present claims recite the selective broadcast of authorization keys/personalization data to the receivers. The selective nature of such a distribution is quite different from the indiscriminate one described by Wilson. Hence, even if the teachings of the cited references were combined in the fashion described in the Office Action, one would not arrive at the invention recited in the present claims.

Srinivasan, US Patent 6,357,042, is cited for teaching a personalization server as recited in claim 16. This is not so. The claimed personalization server operates "to receive a television (TV) broadcast, to include interactive content with the TV broadcast in a broadcast stream, and to create tagged content, the tagged content being marked by tags having one or more authorization keys and/or personalization data". Srinivasan, on the other hand, describes an authoring station (cl. 11 in Fig 1) that is adapted to permit the overlay of graphical or advertising data onto video data. See col. 6, ll. 8-14. There is nothing that suggests the video data is tagged with tags having one or more authorization keys and/or personalization data, which tags match authorization keys and and/or personalization data selectively broadcast to receivers, as claimed. The content described by Srinivasan has not role in personalization of content to receiver and would not fairly suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art such a relationship. Hence, claims 16-20 are separately patentable over the cited references for at least these reasons.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: November 14, 2008

P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station  
Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
650-798-0320

Tarek N. Fahmi

Tarek N. Fahmi  
Reg. No. 41,402